



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mn
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,171	03/25/2004	Henricus Johannes Maria Meijer	MS307136.1/MSFTP615US	7763

27195 7590 05/03/2007

AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

LOVEL, KIMBERLY M.

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2167

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/03/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/809,171	Applicant(s) MARIA MEIJER ET AL.	
	Examiner Kimberly Lovel	Art Unit 2167	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 April 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: _____.
- Claim(s) objected to: _____.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-31.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.


JOHN COTTINGHAM
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In regards to applicants' arguments on page 7-9 referring to the prior art rejections of claims 1-6, 12-16, 18-19, 26 and 29-31, the applicants state: The claimed subject matter relates to a system and method that transforms constructs of different type-systems, from one domain to another domain. This enables various components in different domains to seamlessly share tasks or encapsulated business oriented information, as per the needs of the specific domain application. To that end, claim 1 recites "A system that maps a first construct of a domain to a second construct of another domain." (claims 13, 18, 29, 30 and 31 recite similar features). Charlet et al fails to disclose such claimed aspects. Charlet et al does not disclose a system of transforming a construct from one domain or space to a construct in another domain or space, such as, a construct in the object domain (e.g., an object oriented based artifact) mapped to a construct in the markup domain (e.g., a markup language based artifact). Accordingly, Charlet et al is silent with respect to ... a mapping component that utilizes at least one of a suppress field label and an introduce field label to facilitate mapping the first construct of a domain to the second construct of another domain.

The examiner respectfully disagrees that Charlet fails to disclose the claimed aspects of the amended claim. As cited above Charlet discloses a system [system 400] that maps a first construct [XML document 202] of a domain [markup language] to a second construct [hierarchical database 204] ([0061]) of another domain [relational]. The XML document 202 and the hierarchical database 204 are considered to represent constructs. According to the applicants' specification, an example of a construct is structured data (see page 8, lines 6-7). Since both XML documents and hierarchical databases represent structured data, Charlet is considered to teach the limitation of a first construct and a second construct. Also, the XML document 202 is written in the markup language XML and hierarchical database is considered to be relational. According to applicants' abstract, examples of domains are object, markup, relational and user interface (see abstract, lines 1-3). Therefore, the XML document 202 is considered to represent a first construct of a markup domain and the hierarchical database is considered to be a second construct of the relational domain, which is different than the markup domain.

Regarding the rejections of claims 7-8, 10 and 20, as cited above, Charlet discloses all claim limitations of claims 1 and 18. Therefore, the rejections of claims 7-8, 10 and 20 as being unpatentable over Charlet et al in view of Dorsett, Jr. have been maintained.

Regarding the rejections of claims 11 and 23, as cited above, Charlet discloses all claim limitations of claims 1 and 18. Therefore, the rejections of claims 11 and 23 as being unpatentable over Charlet et al in view of Russell et al have been maintained.

Regarding the rejections of claims 9, 17, 24, 25, 27 and 28, as cited above, Charlet discloses all claim limitations of claims 1, 13 and 18. Therefore, the rejections of claims 9, 17, 24, 25, 27 and 28 as being unpatentable over Charlet et al in view of Meltzer et al have been maintained.